

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are in the case. The applicants have studied the office action dated December 21, 2006 and believe the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claim 11. Claim 11 has been amended as kindly suggested by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 10-17, and 21-27 on the basis of the Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA). Claims 8-9, 18-19 and 28-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of RFC 791 "Darpa Internet Program" hereinafter "DARPA." These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, for example, is directed to a "method for sending data from a source to a destination, comprising: a host providing to a sending agent of the source, virtual memory addresses of data to be sent to a destination wherein the data is stored in a plurality of physical locations of the source, each location having a physical address and a virtual memory address which is mapped to the physical address; the sending agent providing to the host at least some of the virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination; the host identifying to the sending agent the data addressed by the virtual memory addresses provided by the sending agent; and the sending agent sending the identified data to the destination." It is the Examiner's position that the limitation "a host providing to a sending agent of the source, virtual memory addresses of data to be sent to a destination" is met by the Examiner's citation of page 3, lines 18-19 of the AAPA which describes the source host storing data in a buffer which can be accessed by the sending agent. However, the cited AAPA makes clear that the source host of this AAPA sends *physical addresses* to the sending agent:

"The host sends (block 74) the physical memory addresses of the pinned physical memory locations containing the datastream 10 to the sending agent. ..." Specification, ¶13.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has cited no portion of the AAPA which teaches or suggests that the host of this AAPA provides to a sending agent of the source, "virtual memory addresses of data to be sent to a destination" as required by claim 1.

It is the Examiner's position that the limitation "the sending agent providing to the host at least some of the virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination" is met by the Examiner's citation of page 5, lines 19-21 of the AAPA which describes the sending agent continuing to send (block 76) data packets and receiving (block 78) acknowledgments and resending data packets until they are acknowledged (block 78). However, it is believed that the sending agent of the cited AAPA provides the *physical addresses* provided by the host as discussed above, to address the data in the buffer. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has cited no portion of the AAPA which teaches or suggests that the sending agent of this AAPA provides to the host "at least some of the virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination" as required by claim 1.

It is the Examiner's position that the limitation "the host identifying to the sending agent the data addressed by the virtual memory addresses provided by the sending agent" is met by the Examiner's citation of page 5, lines 19-21 of the AAPA which describes the sending agent continuing to send (block 76) data packets and receiving (block 78) acknowledgments and resending data packets until they are acknowledged (block 78). However, it is again believed that the sending agent of this AAPA provides the *physical addresses* provided by the host as discussed above, to address the data in the buffer. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has cited no portion of the AAPA which teaches or suggest that the host in this AAPA identifies to the sending agent "the data addressed by the virtual memory addresses provided by the sending agent" as required by claim 1.

The deficiencies of the Examiner's citations to the AAPA are not met by the Examiner's citations to the DARPA reference. Independent claims 11 and 21 may be distinguished in a similar fashion.

The rejection of the dependent claims is improper for the reasons given above. Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections of the claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 21, 2007

By: /William Konrad/

William K. Konrad
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:

William K. Konrad
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7970
Fax: 310-556-7984